



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,051	01/29/2001	Kazuhisa Shida	0941.65172	8505

24978 7590 08/08/2002

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN  
300 S WACKER DR  
25TH FLOOR  
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER
----------

UHLIR, NIKOLAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1773

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2002

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/772,051

Applicant(s)

SHIDA ET AL.

Examiner

Nikolas J. Uhler

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1773

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Claims 8-15 are noted to contain nominal method steps. At this time restriction has not been required between the product claims 1-7 and 16 and the method claims 8-13 and 15 because the method claims do not recite any significant manipulative steps and therefore considered as part of the product claims. If the method claims are amended to contain significant method steps they will be subject to restriction based on original presentation.

### ***Specification***

2. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: In the instant case, the applicant in claims 5 and 12 recites a limitation requiring both the first and second underlayers to include at least one element selected from Mo, Ti, W, V, and Ta. There is no antecedent basis in the specification for a first underlayer that contains one of the above-cited elements. Correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1 and 8 recite the limitation "said first magnetic layer having a Cr-Content larger than that of said second magnetic layer, and having a sum-total of non-magnetic elements which are other than chromium..." in lines 7-10 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In the instant case, replacement of "a magnetic layer made of a Co-Cr based alloy" (located in the 1st three

Art Unit: 1773

lines of each claim) with "a magnetic layer comprising a Co-Cr based alloy and non-magnetic elements other than Cr" is sufficient to overcome this rejection.

5. Claims 1, 4, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In the instant case, these claims recite the phrase "made of." It is unclear to the examiner whether the applicant is utilizing this phrase as "open" or "closed" terminology. The examiner recommends that the applicant change "made of" to "comprising" if the term is intended to be "open," or if the term is intended to be closed, the examiner suggests the applicant change "made of" to "consisting." Clarification is required.

6. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1 recites the Claim 1 recites the phrase "larger atomic radius than cobalt than said second layer," and claim 7 recites the phrase "larger atomic radius than cobalt than the lowermost." It is unclear to the examiner whether the applicant is requiring that the nonmagnetic elements have a larger atomic radius than Cobalt **and** the second magnetic layer, Cobalt **or** the second magnetic layer, or **just** Cobalt.

7. Claims 2, 5, 8, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In the instant case, the applicant in these claims recites the phrase, "selected from a group of." This is improper Markush group

Art Unit: 1773

language. In the instant case, replacement of "selected from a group of" with "selected from the group consisting of" is sufficient to overcome this rejection.

8. Claims 3, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In the instant case in these claims the applicant recites the limitation "approximately 8-15 at% of Pr, and approximately 1 to 6 at% of B." The term "Pr" appears to be a typo, and is believed to be "Pt." Praseodymium is a rare earth element that is not discussed in the specification as suitable for use in the claimed invention. Correction is required.

9. Claim 14 recites the limitation "forms the first underlayer at a substrate bias voltage of appoximately" in lines 3-7 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In the instant case, claim 14 is dependent on 11, which in turn is dependent on claim 8. Claims 8 and 11 do not provide antecedent basis for a method that includes applying a bias to a substrate, as they simply recite that step "c" is carried out by "forming" a first underlayer on a substrate. The applicant is reminded that insertion of a substantial method steps (such as a method which would utilize a substrate bias such as sputtering) into the method claims will result in the restriction of the method claims based on original presentation.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 1773

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1-3, 7-10, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parkin (US5583727) in view of Paik et al. (IEEE Transactions on Magnetics, Vol 28, #5, Sept. 1992, pp 3084-3086), further in view of Tani et al (IEEE Transactions on Magnetics, Vol. 27, #6, Nov. 1991, pp 4736-4733).

For the purpose of this examination, the examiner has interpreted the term "Pr" in claims 3 and 10 as Pt.

Parkin teaches a magnetic recording medium comprising a substrate, an underlayer deposited on the substrate, and multiple magnetic data recording material layers (data layers) deposited on the underlayer. The substrate is typically glass or or an aluminum alloy disk. The underlayer is typically chromium or another suitable material, and the magnetic layer is a Cobalt based alloy (column 9, lines 35-58). Each of the data layers is preferably comprised of a different magnetic material, or of the same material with a different composition. The data layers are required to possess different magnetic moments so that when the superposed flux from the magnetic layers I received by the sensor, the sensor can distinguish the data from different data layers (column 9, lines 59-67). In addition, the data layers are required to have different coercivities to allow writing on each of the magnetic layers independently without affecting data previously written on other layers (column 10, lines 1-3). Parkin teaches that individual data layers can be written upon utilizing a method known as the sequential layer write scheme. This scheme requires that data layers having the highest coercivity are deposited closest to the substrate, with subsequent layers being

Art Unit: 1773

deposited in order of decreasing coercivity. Materials particularly suited for this purpose include various CoCrPtB alloys (column 10, lines 4-20). Parkin also teaches that these materials can be read by a digital giant magneto resistance sensor (column 12, lines 6-7)

Parkin does not teach a magnetic recording medium that comprises a substrate, A first magnetic layer comprised of a CoCr alloy, and at least one second magnetic layer comprised of a CoCr alloy deposited on the first magnetic layer, wherein the first and second magnetic layers contain 8-15 at% Pt and 1-6% B, and the first magnetic layer has a Cr content higher than that of the second magnetic layer, and a larger sum total of non-magnetic elements other than Cr than the second magnetic layer.

Paik et al. teaches the effects of B and Cr concentration on the magnetic properties of CoCrPtB alloys that are deposited onto aluminum substrates having a Cr underlayer (pp 3084, left column, last paragraph.) Figure <sup>4</sup>~~3~~ clearly shows how the coercivity of a CoCrPt<sub>6</sub>B<sub>6</sub> alloy peaks at a chromium concentration of ~10 at%, and decreases as the at% of chromium is increased or decreased. Last, Paik et al. teaches that this alloy is well known to be used as a magnetic media for hard disks (pp<sup>3084</sup>~~4736~~ 1st paragraph, left column).

Tani et al. teaches the effects platinum concentration on the magnetic properties of a CoCr<sub>10</sub>PtB<sub>3</sub> alloy film that is deposited on an aluminum substrate having a chromium underlayer (see table 1). Figure 4 clearly shows how the coercivity of this alloy peaks at a Pt concentration of ~14 at%, and decreases as the Pt concentration is increased or decreased.



Art Unit: 1773

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to utilize a  $\text{CoCr}_{10}\text{Pt}_{14}\text{B}_3$  alloy as described by Tani et al. as the first data layer (closest to the substrate) in Parkin et al. It would have further been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to coat this first layer with additional layers, wherein each additional layer contains less Cr and less Pt.

One would have been motivated to make this modification for the following reasons. Parkin clearly shows that the data layers of a multiple data layer magnetic recording media can be suitably formed from various compositions of a CoCrPtB alloy, wherein the first data layer closest to the substrate is the highest coercivity layer, and subsequent layers deposited on the first layer have lower coercivity. Paik et al. and Tani et al. clearly show that a maximum coercivity of ~3000 Oe can be achieved utilizing a CoCrPtB alloy the comprises 10 at% Cr, ~14 at% Pt, and ~3 at% B. Further, Paik et al. and Tani et al. clearly demonstrate how the coercivity of a COCrPtB alloy decreases substantially as the Cr content is lowered below 10 at% and as the Pt concentration is lowered below 14 at%. Thus, there is clear motivation to utilize the  $\text{CoCr}_{10}\text{Pt}_{14}\text{B}_3$  alloy as the first data layer in Parkin, and there is clear motivation to decrease the amount of Pt and Cr in subsequent layers deposited on the first data layer.

12. Claims 4-5, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parkin in view of Paik et al., further in view of Tani et al. as applied to claim 1-3, 7-10, and 15-16 above, and further in view of Malhotra et al. (US6303217) and Bian et al. (US5789056).



Parkin in view of Paik et al., further in view of Tani et al. teaches all of the limitations of claims 4-5 and 11-12 as stated above, except for those limitations detailed below.

Parkin in view of Paik et al., further in view of Tani et al. does not teach a magnetic recording medium comprising a substrate, a first underlayer deposited next to the substrate, a second underlayer deposited on the first underlayer, and multiple magnetic layers of a CoCr alloy deposited on the second underlayer. In addition, Parkin in view of Paik et al., further in view of Tani et al. does not teach that the first and second underlayers comprise a Cr alloy that includes at least one element selected from Mo, Ti, W, V, and Ta, wherein the second underlayer contains a larger sum total of elements other than chromium than the first underlayer.

Malhotra et al. teaches a magnetic recording media that comprises a substrate, a first underlayer, a second underlayer, and a magnetic recording layer deposited on the second underlayer. The first underlayer can comprise a Cr alloy that comprises between 5-30 at% of Mo, Ta, V, W, Ti etc... The second underlayer can comprise a Cr alloy that contains 5-30 at% of Mo, V, Ta, Ti, etc...or a ternary alloy of Cr that contains 5-30 at% of two elements selected from Mo, Ta, V, Ti, etc... (column 1, line 55-column 2, line 18). The magnetic layer is a cobalt based alloy, including CoCr, CoCrTa, CoCrPt, CoCrNiPtB, and other alloys containing at least 50% Co (column 4, line 19-30). This underlayer structure results in a magnetic recording media that exhibits improved signal amplitude (column 1, lines 50-53).

Art Unit: 1773

13. Bian et al. teaches a magnetic recording media that comprises a substrate, a seed layer, a underlayer, and a magnetic recording layer deposited on the underlayer. The seed layer is an alloy of Cr and Ti, wherein the amount of Ti is >5at% (column 2, lines 39-63). The underlayer is comprised of a chromium alloy such as  $\text{CrV}_x$ , where x is 0-50 at% and  $\text{CrTi}_y$ , where y is 0-30 at% (column 3, line 66-column 4, line 2). The magnetic layer includes CoCrPt and CoCrPtTa (column 4, lines 8-15). Bian et al. teaches that the amount of Ti in the seed layer affects the signal to noise ratio (S/N) of the resulting magnetic media, with a higher Ti concentration resulting in a higher S/N ratio than a lower Ti concentration (see table 2). In addition, Bian et al. teaches that the amount of Ti in the underlayer is chosen with consideration to the composition of the magnetic layer. Ideally, the lattice of the underlayer is matched to the lattice of the magnetic layer. Ti expands the Cr lattice, and so the amount of Ti present is chosen to match the lattice of the magnetic alloy utilized in the formation of the magnetic layer. Thus, the examiner takes the position that the amount of Ti in both the first underlayer (seed layer) and the second underlayer is a results effective variable, and it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the concentration of Ti in each layer to achieve a desired S/N ratio and a desired lattice match between the second underlayer and the magnetic recording layer.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the underlayer system described by Malhotra et al. wherein each underlayer comprises an alloy of Cr and Ti as the underlayer used in Parkin in view of Paik et al., further in view of Tani et al.

One would have been motivated to make this modification due to the teaching in Malhotra et al. that a magnetic recording medium that utilizes two underlayers comprised of an alloy of Cr and one element selected from Mo, V, Ta, Ti, and W exhibits improved signal amplitude.

14. Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parkin in view of Paik et al., Tani et al., Malhotra et al., and Bian et al. as applied to claims 4-5 and 11-12 above, and further in view of Bertero et al. (US6150015).

Parkin in view of Paik et al., Tani et al., Malhotra et al., and Bian et al. teaches all of the limitations of claims 6 and 13 as stated above, except for those limitations listed below.

Parkin in view of Paik et al., Tani et al., Malhotra et al., and Bian et al. does not teach an intermediate layer made of a Co based alloy disposed between the second underlayer and the first magnetic layer.

Bertero et al. teaches a magnetic media that comprises a substrate, a chromium or chromium alloy underlayer on the substrate, an ultra thin nucleation layer comprising Co based alloy deposited on the underlayer, and a magnetic layer comprising a Co alloy such as CoCrPt on the nucleation layer (column 15, line 54-column 16, lines 25). Magnetic media utilizing the nucleation layer exhibit drastically improved coercivity and squareness as compared to media that do not utilize the nucleation layer.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize a thin nucleation layer of a Co based alloy as

Art Unit: 1773

described by Bertero et al. between the second underlayer and the first magnetic layer described by Parkin in view of Paik et al., Tani et al., Malhotra et al., and Bian et al.

One would have been motivated to make this modification due to the teaching in Bertero et al. that magnetic media that incorporate a Co based alloy as a nucleation layer exhibit drastically improved coercivity and squareness as compared to those media that do not utilize a nucleation layer.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nikolas J. Uhler whose telephone number is 703-305-0179. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul Thibodeau can be reached on 703-308-2367. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-0389.

*nju*

nju  
August 2, 2002



**STEVAN A. RESAN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**